PMRIPT/PSMC

Systems Engineering Team

Status Brief

Nov ‘06

SE Team Members

- – LMI (Facilitator)
- – ASC
- – DSPO
- – Navy (Crane)
- – OSD (Systems Eng!)
- – HQ-AFMC/ENP
- – Boeing
- – Raytheon
- (Your Name Here!)

Systems Engineering Team

"We have no idea what we're doing!"

Reasons:

1) Policies not yet in place…thus, world out to get us!

2) "Performance-Based" anything is still evolving… ..like FLE. Is it PBA, PBL, or PBS?

3) DMSMS is no help whatsoever!

- DMSMS is important, but it falls short of what we're talking about. It's a subset of what we're talking about. But…it's funded! (We ***love*** DMSMS!)

What we've done so far...

- Attended as many meetings as possible
  - Key members missing each time
- Helped deploy Community of Practice (CoP) on Air Force Knowledge Now (AFKN) (34 members)
  - https://www.my.af.mil/afknprod/ASPs/CoP/EntryCoP.asp?Filter=OO-EN-KO-03
- Identified policies, procedures, and course material which need to be better "targeted"
- Realized just how dirty the phrase "Parts Management" really is!
- Come to realize just how far we have to go!
  - The tortoise, thru persistence, will win this race!

different. See http://akss.dau.mil/dag/Guidebook/IG_c4.2.4.asp
for more on the terminology used in the DAG to describe system elements.
2) Make it clear what you mean when you say "standard part". This should be based on the
concept of 'part' (discussed above) and also on one or more of the basic standardization types
(interface, design criteria, manufacturing process, best practice, and test method) defined in
DoD 4120.24-M (http://west.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/html/412024m.htm).
3) Describe how parts management as an activity relates to other system lifecycle activities,
processes and considerations. I suggest that you do this by first highlighting related activities
on the wall chart (http://akss.dau.mil/ifc/) and then review the related descriptions in DAG sect
4.3. (http://akss.dau.mil/dag/Guidebook/IG_c4.3.asp) to determine how parts management is
different. Also, I suggest you look at sections 4.4.1, 4.4.3., 4.4.9 to ensure that parts management considerations are not already addressed and determine what adjustments are
needed, if any. Look at 4.2.3.6, 4.2.3.7., 4.2.4.1., 4.2.4.4. and others to determine if aspects
that are unique to parts management are not covered by the current guidance that generally
refers to system components and configuration items.
4) List the overall program objectives, benefits and risks that you believe parts management
supports or mitigates. For example, reuse, tech insertion, competition, DMSMS, etc.

(...from SE) Recommendations

What might be next?

- Development of more “concept”…to help explain and define future direction
  - Stay the course with respect to MIL-STD-XXXX; SD-19; __’s Roadmap; etc.
- Exploration of Performance-Based Supportability
- More reliance on PSMC to help sustain to direction
  - ..especially in this resource-constrained environment
- Your Idea Here!